UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

China In Crisis

Marshal Yu Hsing Fung as Given to Professor Jerome Davis of Yale University.

Modern Preaching and Jesus' Method

- - - - *Joseph Ernest McAfee*

Sanctions: Are They Right or Wrong?

- - - - - *John Haynes Holmes*

Travel Letters—III—In Japan

- - - - - *Alson H. Robinson*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXVII NUMBER 2

Chicago, March 16, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 23
Jottings—J. H. H. 26

ARTICLES—
China in Crisis—Marshal Yu Hsing Fung as Given to Professor Jerome Davis of Yale University 26
Modern Preaching and Jesus' Method—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 29
Sanctions: Are They Right or Wrong?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 31
Travel Letters—III—In Japan—ALSON H. ROBINSON 36

POETRY—
Church of the Churchless—ROBERT WHITAKER 23
As to War—JACK GREENBERG 35

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Peacemakers—JULIAN M. DRACHMAN 28
Pity Them—RALPH CHAPLIN 28
Decade Passes On—GRACE MINER LIPPINCOTT 28
Medicine Chest—ANN WINSLOW 28
Beliefs—ROSA ZAGNONI MARINONI 28

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Great American on America—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE .. 37
Clive of India—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 38

CORRESPONDENCE—
Further Reply from Dr. Whitaker 39

THE FIELD—
Senator William E. Borah on the Constitution and Democracy—An extract from an article in *Redbook Magazine* 22

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Senator William E. Borah on the Constitution and Democracy*

I am now finally asked how I view the Supreme Court in the light of the world-wide struggle between democracy and dictatorship. I am reminded that some of the most earnest advocates of democracy in this country are equally earnest, apparently, in demanding an abridgment or even an abrogation of the power of the Court. I am asked my attitude toward this conflict of opinion. I can state it perfectly explicitly:

It is my feeling that, when the framers of the Constitution lodged the power to amend the Constitution in the people, and conferred upon the Supreme Court the power to annul acts found to be in violation of the Constitution, they made this a government of law rather than of men. And only by preserving both the Constitution and the power of the Court can we be certain that it will remain a government of law.

When Septimus Severus was dying he said to his successor, "Pay the soldiers, and don't worry about anything else." His idea apparently was that so long as the soldiers were not disaffected the government would stand. One might almost say, "So far as Communism or Fascism is concerned, preserve the Constitution with its free speech, free press, right of assemblage, and the other guaranties, and don't worry about anything else."

As I see it, the combat between Communism and Fascism on the one hand, and democracy on the other, in the last analysis, comes down to the simple question: What, if any, place shall be given to the average man and woman in government? What voice shall they have? Both Communism and Fascism would rob them of every right, every privilege, every guaranty given them in our Constitution—personal liberty, and all the attributes of liberty. The first line of defense therefore against a dictatorial government is the

*An extract from an article in *Redbook Magazine*.—Editor.

(*Continued on page* 40)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVII MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1936 No. 2

CHURCH OF THE CHURCHLESS

Church of the churchless multitudes,
Home for all humankind;
Rock-ribbed in man's profoundest moods,
Domed in the open-mind
In thee we harvest yet the past,
We seed the years to be;
Here, where all classes are unclassed,
And all unfreed are free.

Here would we welcome every race,
And speak for every tongue;
Here would a universal grace
From every land be sung.
Here may all creeds their truth fulfill,
All rituals inspire,
To calm and strengthen righteous will,
And mould the pure desire.

O Living Church of living men,
Let life so speak in thee,
The morning stars shall sing again
Creation's ecstasy.
Let us so live, each hour, each day,
So shape this present sphere,
Ours shall be, even now, the way
Of an eternal year.

—Robert Whitaker.

DEMOCRACY BATTLING FOR ITS LIFE

Historians invariably generalize about the past and therewith reveal the essential character of an epoch, and trace the course of social evolution. It is not difficult to surmise as to what the historians of the future will say about the present era. They will declare, we have no doubt, that the first half of the twentieth century was the period of the testing of democracy. This democracy was the supreme achievement of the nineteenth century. When this century gave way to its successor, it seemed as though this achievement were permanent. Democracy had been won, and thus added to the vast store of man's accomplishments upon this earth! Then came the World War, and the crash of democracy in the universal ruin which followed upon this catastrophe. Now democracy is battling for its life and, at the moment, apparently, battling in vain. On front after front, the fight has been lost, and all the institutions, customs, laws and habits of free society swept away. In Russia, of course, there never was any democracy. But the first period of the 1917 revolution inaugurated a liberal regime, which hardly had begun its life before it was extinguished by the Bolsheviki. In Italy the great work of Garibaldi, Mazzini, Cavour, D'Azelio, and other leaders of the democracy of fifty years ago, has been destroyed by the ruthless hand of Mussolini, and a tyranny of monstrous proportions set up in its place. Germany has suffered similar disaster, with the last vestiges of liberty swept away by Adolph Hitler. The little countries established by the Versailles and St. German Treaties have all lapsed into barbarous dictatorships with the single exception of Czecho-Slovakia, whose fate waits upon the death of Masaryck. Spain is still struggling to maintain the new, and France the old, democracy identified with their history. Only in the Scandinavian countries, Britain, and America, is democracy holding its own. Sore beset, the laws and practices of freedom in these countries still maintain their ascendancy. What may happen in the future may well be doubtful. It may be that democracy will be lost from our western world. But our own conviction is that it is being tested today only in the end to be saved. If so, it will be because the people of England, America, Scandinavia have refused to be deceived, and have kept the faith for themselves and their posterity.

ASSASSINATION IN JAPAN

The assassination in cold blood, without warning, of the Premier of a great government (now risen from the dead!) and of four of his cabinet ministers is an event to shock the nerves even of our contemporary world which is destined, apparently, to witness every horror. Nearer and nearer we seem to be moving back to savagery. Not since the days of the Merovingian kings can we recall anything quite to parallel the deeds of blood which are staining the calendar of our days. What is involved in this violent *coup* in Tokyo will probably be much clearer when this editorial is read than now when it is being written. But already it is reasonably plain that Fascist officers, resolved to have nothing stand in the way of militarist rule at home and

imperialist conquest abroad, attempted to wipe out in a night the liberal and moderate influences still left in political Japan. What Mussolini did in Italy and Hitler in Germany, these officers tried to do in the East, and so great is their power and so considerable their victory that even the Emperor has been forced to do their will. From now on we can imagine no halting of Japanese policy in China and, in due time, in Siberia. Which makes imminent the long anticipated war between Russia and Japan! One wonders what the people of Tokyo and the country generally are doing in the midst of such events. Where is the leadership of Kagawa, and his trades unions, cooperatives, and peace societies? Probably as terrorized and therefore as helpless as the Socialists, the Communists, the trade unionists, the pacifists in Germany when the Nazis seized the land! There is a frightful thoroughness about these Fascist uprisings these days, and opposition seems to disappear before it like sand grains before the wind. The horizon has been dark for months, but clouds of inky blackness seem now to be engulfing the eastern skies. Could "dies irae" be any worse than this?

MILITARY EXPENDITURES

We ought to be writing a stinging editorial these days giving the facts and figures of military expenditures, and then pouring out the vials of our wrath upon such statistical abominations. But we confess the very thought of it tires us, and in our heart we seem to hear the refrain, What's the use? To protest against these things is a high duty, even when the people lie down in pusillanimous inactivity and let the war-makers do whatever they want with the taxpayers' money, but what will it avail in the present temper of the world? About as much as a feather in the wind, or a mop in a flood. Glance around the world and see what's going on in this business of preparedness! *England*—modernizing her fleet, and extending her air-force to proportions which will match the rivalry of any other nation. *France*—signing and sealing an alliance with Russia, just like the old *entente* with the Tsar, and raising her armaments to any limit necessary to fulfil her part of the bargain of arms. *Germany*—spending more money on her armaments alone in 1935 than Great Britain expended on her whole national budget for that year, and all set to do the same, or more, this current year. *Russia*—announcing the immediate enlargement of her army and navy, to meet the peril of Germany on the west and Japan on the east. *Italy*—with all her male population under arms, her little boys in the schools in drill formation, and in the offing a treaty of alliance with Germany and Austria, just like the old triple alliance before the War. And now the United States, at the dictation of the financial and munitions forces, passing the hugest army appropriations bill in the country's history, and at the same time tossing any effective neutrality program into the ash-can. What can be said or done in the face of such proceedings? Cry, Woe, Woe, like Jeremiah? Curse God and die, like Job? Laugh cynically and say with Shakespeare, What fools these mortals be? All such reactions are understandable, but none is worthy. Least of all is it worthy to give way to despair, or even fatigue. Rather shall we believe that these policies are devilish, and say so, and fight against them with voice and pen, with mind and soul, until our days on earth are done. And this is possible because we have faith, even in days like these, that God reigns.

NORMAN THOMAS AND THE PRESIDENT

Norman Thomas' speech last month over the radio, in answer to "Al" Smith's notorious Liberty League speech, has been published by the Socialist Party in pamphlet form. We advise all our readers to get this speech and read it. It answers for all time the silly charge that President Roosevelt is a Socialist or his New Deal program taken from the Socialist platform. It's amazing, when you come to think of it, that there should be so much muddy thinking as to the character and significance of the administration policies. Here is Ogden Mills, in his new book, denouncing the President as a Tory, and describing his measures as an advance toward Fascism. On the other hand is "Al" Smith's suave talk about Communism, Moscow, and the Red Flag. Norman Thomas, in the only sensible and intelligent statement on this question that has been made in months, tells precisely what is the fact in this confusion. As might be suspected, Mills is a good deal nearer right than Smith. What Mr. Roosevelt has been doing, or trying to do, these last three years, is to repair and restore capitalism. But Socialism would get rid of capitalism altogether! The President has been trying desperately to restore high prices in order to reestablish profits. But Socialism would destroy profits altogether and therewith lower prices to a minimum! The President is moving heaven and earth to create scarcity, since capitalism can function only in terms of scarcity. But Socialism would create abundance, and distribute it for the benefit of all! In saying these things, we are not praising Socialism nor dispraising the President. We are not at this moment passing judgment but stating facts. What we want is some distinction between truth and fancy or prejudice, and real understanding as to what is going on. The mystery in the whole situation today is the unwillingness or inability of the industrialists to see what Mr. Roosevelt is doing and give him their support. He is the one best friend they have! Their repudiation of him is a form of madness, of which the charge of Socialism is a particularly dangerous symptom.

HYPOCRISY!

What makes the new Farm Law so disgusting is its hypocrisy. It is described as a measure for the

control and prevention of soil erosion. It is nothing of the sort, as everybody knows from the President and his Secretary of Agriculture down to the humblest page-boy in the House or Senate. There is no need of any legislation for the protection of the soil, for it was only a year ago that the Soil Conservation Act was passed by Congress for this very purpose. The object of the new measure is identical with that of the old AAA—to enable the farmers to get artificially high prices for their products at the expense of the industrial workers and city dwellers generally. The Supreme Court destroyed the abomination of the old law, and the President and Congress have joined hands to evade the decision of the Court by passing a new law which, by one hypocrisy or another, will do what the Supreme Court declared was in violation of the Constitution. We insist that the decision in the AAA case is now the law of the land, and that the administration is undertaking to nullify it by as arrant a piece of dishonesty as the country has ever known. What wonder that distrust of the Roosevelt crowd is growing by leaps and bounds, and that this distrust threatens soon to become out-and-out fear! Personally, we had rather see the President disband the Supreme Court and seize all power, like Mussolini in Italy, than seek his political ends by these sneaky, evasive, hypocritical methods. The dictators, whatever their faults and crimes, are at least honest and above board! A little more of this kind of government by indirection and pretension, and the issue of the forthcoming presidential campaign will be simply that of everyday morality.

INVESTIGATING DR. TOWNSEND

What does this investigation of Dr. Townsend mean? The vote in the House of Representatives—240 in favor and only 4 against—would seem to indicate one thing, and that is that the politicians are glad to get on the trail and slay the monster before it is too late. It has long been known that this crowd of Congressional cowards in Washington are scared to death of the Plan, knowing full well that, when or if the showdown comes, they have not the guts to face and deal with it on its merits or demerits. So they want to get rid of it before they have to take any attitude toward it, and a "smearing" expedition may do just what they most desire. Then, too, there is the threat from the Townsendites of interference in the forthcoming election campaign. Confusion and uncertainty are bad enough, aren't they, with no Democrat or Republican sure of anything amid the shifting tides of the New Deal, without Dr. Townsend and his cohorts muscling in and turning everything to chaos? So let's see if we can't pin something on him and dispose of him. But there are deeper implications! This Townsend Plan is suggesting things that the people ought not to be told. That the care of the aged, for example, is a social responsibility which should be laid squarely on the shoulders of government! That there ought to be a more general and equitable distribution of wealth, with the old folks who have worked hard all their lives having something to show for their labor! That there would be plenty of income to go around, if only the productive resources of the country were released to abundance instead of being bound fast to scarcity! What is the $2400 a year for 60-year old pensioners when compared with the estimate of the Potential Product Capacity Survey Group that the country could produce enough today to provide an income of $4370 per year per family? This is dangerous knowledge, and if a Congressional investigation can discredit it, let's get to it! We hasten to emphasize at this point that we are not Townsendites, that we do not believe in the Plan, that on the contrary we regard it as so foolish as to be tragic if not also comic. But when it comes to a Congress of New Deal Democrats and Old Deal Republicans investigating Townsend, we cry, Hands off!

PAVLOV THE MECHANIST

The death of Ivan Pavlov marks the passing of one of the greatest scientists of our day. This Russian, to whom the Russian revolution was significant only as a bothersome intrusion upon his labors, was one of the supreme experimentalists of all time. His dogs are probably destined to be as immortal as Darwin's pigeons and Pasteur's sheep. He revealed new conditions and laws of inner life, and, from his own viewpoint at least, ended forever the superstition of the soul. Man as a mere machine, his organism a lump of matter composed of atoms like the sand-particles of a brick, his life a bundle of conditioned reflexes—this, to quote the New York *Times,* "may not have been new, but it acquired strength through his tests." What Pavlov did was to carry the materialist concept to its farthest limits, and to produce its ultimate evidences. But just to the extent that he went so far, he fell just so far short. It was the supreme irony of the life of this greatest of the mechanists that his doctrine was crashing about his ears even as he was making his demonstrations. "Mind, soul matter—all one," was his proclamation. To which there comes the answer, "Yes! but not all matter—all mind!" In other words, if we can explain the universe at all today, it must be in mathematical formulae which require mind in the cosmos as in man. It is true that the human, like the animal, is much less a creature of voluntary behavior than we had supposed. Pavlov certainly proved this fact! But to infer from this that the human is *in toto* a mere machine is as outmoded a concept as the Tsarist regime under which the great scientist began his work. If the physicists, chemists and biologists of our time are demonstrating anything, it is that materialism is as dead a philosophy as creationism is a religion. "The theories of the mechanists [are] only a little higher than primitive superstitious beliefs in spirits."

Jottings

What has become of all the doughty rebels who were denouncing the "nine old men" on the Supreme Court bench and calling vociferously for their removal? We haven't heard from these since the TVA decision. Will they shout again when the Court chances to decide against them instead of for them, or will they have learned that there is such a thing as being a good sport in law as well as in athletics?

Mussolini is trying hard to beat the spring rains into Addis Ababa. Since time is so precious, why doesn't he command the sun to stand still, so that he may finish his conquest? Surely it should be as easy for this mountebank to play Joshua as Caesar.

Dr. William Temple, the Archbishop of York, has declared that "the law of love is not applicable to nations consisting in large measure of unconverted or very imperfectly converted citizens." UNITY herewith offers a prize of the handsomest and most expensive Bible published by the American Bible Society to any one, subscriber or non-subscriber, who will point out the Scriptural passage upon which this Christian pronouncement is based.

Mr. Roosevelt's "luck" is incredible. His most dangerous foe in his own party, Huey Long, was killed. His ablest foe in his own party, Ex-Governor Ritchie, is now dead. If we were "Al" Smith, we would wrap ourself in cotton-wool, make no unusual exertions and ride in no automobiles, until after the election.

We hold no brief for "Al" Smith these days. But when Professor Counts classifies Mr. Smith with Mr. Hearst as an enemy of human liberty, he does as foolish a thing as the *Red Net Work* does when it classifies Mrs. Roosevelt and Mayor La Guardia and Earl Browder together as "reds." Is there no such thing any longer as discrimination?

"Cable communication was functioning normally except for the censorship." New York *Herald-Tribune*, in reference to events in Japan.

Or, as you might say, the body was functioning normally, except for cancer! Or, the machine was functioning normally except for sand in the gears!

J. H. H.

China in Crisis

MARSHAL YU HSING FUNG AS GIVEN TO PROFESSOR JEROME DAVIS OF YALE UNIVERSITY*

Marshal Fung, who formerly controlled the military forces of North China but whose party was defeated by the allies of General Chiang Kai-shek, now lives on the sacred mountain of Taishan in the Province of Shantung. He is awaiting his chance to come back to help the people of China. It will be remembered that he has been famous all over the world as the Christian General. When he took the city of Tientsin in 1925 there was no looting, no disorder, no rape as happened so often with other troops. Actually his troops marched up the streets on Christmas Eve singing "Hark the Herald Angels Sing."

We arrived by train in a cloud-burst of rain. Armed guards at the station scrutinized each person who alighted, but we were met by a special representative of the General who escorted us to jinrikishas, the two-wheeled, man-pulled vehicle of China. The water was ankle-deep in the streets as we began to ride up the mountain path, each jinrikisha being pushed by two additional men. On the way we had to cross a river where the water swirled into the bottom of our carriages. Two minutes after we were safely over, the rain from the mountain slopes had so augmented the river that it was a mad, raging, impassible torrent. At intervals, as we ascended, we saw armed guards stationed to watch every approach. They were picturesque figures carrying revolvers and holding curved sabres ready in their hands.

After nearly an hour of moving up the rocky zigzag mountain trail, we reached the first stone outposts of the general. We were ushered into what appeared to be a study and library. Around the wall were pictures of the supporters of Marshal Fung in addition to one of General Chiang Kai-shek. Among others was a picture of Eugene Chen, a former Foreign Minister but now in danger of his life from the present government, and so in exile in France. The pictures of Lee Sung and Hu Han Min, who took part in the People's Revolutionary Government of Canton in 1927, were also in prominence. The Canton Government was suppressed by Chiang Kai-shek, and these leaders and others were forced to flee abroad for their lives.

After being served tea and a breakfast of bean soup, vegetables and Chinese hot bread, we were invited to enter swinging canvas chairs. Then, suspended on the shoulders of two men and covered with huge umbrellas, we were carried up and up over rocky promontories and along rocky precipices. Meanwhile, the water poured down over the rocks in a perfect cascade. After a half hour of this adventure, we arrived at a cluster of stone houses surrounded by more armed guards. We were at the General's headquarters which command a view of the entire valley.

We were shown into a long stone room with a big table in it. After tea was poured, Marshal

*Dr. Davis does not necessarily agree with the views expressed, but has tried to portray faithfully the views of General Fung. No doubt the latter has been influenced in his attitude by the fact that he has been kept out of all activity by the present government, although since this article was written, it is reported that General Chiang Kai-shek has come to terms with General Fung and that both are working harmoniously towards the regeneration of China.

Fung entered—a man of mammoth proportions, well over six feet tall. Thoroughly Chinese in appearance, the general's looks betray the fact that he has never had a chance at university education but has fought his way up from the bottom. He is doing all in his power to overcome the difficulty, for every morning he arises at the early hour of five and studies until noon. In cooperation with his wife, who is a Christian and a university graduate, he conducts ten free schools for the poor children of the vicinity. No child can attend unless its parents are too poor to pay the tuition of the neighboring schools. In all, about six hundred children are being cared for. One-half of their time is spent in study and one-half in practical work such as carpentering, drawing, making Chinese ink stones, et cetera. There are no holidays except at harvest time when the children are released to help the farmers.

General Fung began his interview, in response to a question from me as to what he thought of the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, by a terrific indictment of its weaknesses.

"The leaders are out primarily for themselves. No other opponents or political parties are allowed. Any one who dares to criticize or join a rival party is imprisoned. He has deserted the principles of Sun Yat Sen so that the widow of the latter is bitterly hostile to him. Seven thousand political opponents of his are imprisoned in Nanking alone. Among them are professors, students and scientists. Occasionally all sorts of tortures are used, including hot irons, floggings, and even such brutal treatment that men die. Sometimes they take men out and shoot them. These are not necessarily Communists. In dying, they will call out, 'Sun Yat Sen' or 'Hurrah for Socialism,' showing that their only thought is for the welfare of China and the Chinese people. I had several friends who were imprisoned and when they were released they gave me the inside facts. Even in the case of the Communists, they can hardly be said to be worthy of such treatment; most of them are Chinese students who have a passionate desire self-sacrificingly to serve their fellowmen and they should be saved to help China, not shot merely because they have not yet been able to see things just as we want them to."

I asked him if it would be of any help to form a Chinese committee to help those who were imprisoned. He replied that anything was better than remaining quiescent. Although he believed the Central Government so tyrannical that little could be done in the case of most of the arrested, still such an organization might be of help in certain cases and at least it might mitigate the cruelties.

General Fung continued:

"The present regime is doing what the Japanese want. It is hostile to Soviet Russia and shooting the Chinese. It is far worse than Hitler in Germany, because it is subservient to a foreign power (Japan) and is concentrating all its efforts in shooting down its own people. No wonder so many have been antagonized. The Generalissimo opposes me although my only desire is as a Christian general to serve the people of China. He has kicked out any military man whom he thought might interfere with his selfish purposes. The right wing of the opposition was forced to set up a new government at Canton to try and save China, but this was destroyed with the aid of Japanese airplanes. The left wing is now struggling underground at the risk of its life."

I asked whether the Generalissimo was sincere in his efforts to control and abolish opium. The reply was:

"You can judge for yourself how sincere the General is when I tell you that he has five gunboats flying the flag of the National Government which are used to transport opium from Szechwan to Shanghai. It is impossible to tell what he uses this opium money for, possibly to support the political groups which are working for him. He has built up a large bureaucracy, spending the money of the state to keep the people favorable, but even the groups which are supposed to be for him are fighting among themselves, sometimes even with guns. From forty to sixty per cent of his actions are influenced by the bankers and business men, and as to the rest he is more or less a complete dictator. The most important need for China now is to oppose the imperialistic aims of Japan rather than to kill Chinese peasants who revolt because of their poverty. If conditions were constructively improved for the peasants, that would cure Communism, but they will never be cured by killing. For every one killed, a hundred new ones are created. Even now it is admitted by the Governor of the neighboring Province of Shensi that there are to be found seven hundred thousand Communists. If General Chiang Kai-skek finally decides to oppose Japan, then the outlook is hopeful; but, if not, the whole situation is shameful and a betrayal of China."

I asked if General Fung favored securing help from Soviet Russia. He replied:

"No, the Chinese people must clean up their own conditions and win freedom without outside help, but if we fight against Japan even the Japanese people will help us. We have no quarrel with the Japanese people. Our quarrel is with the imperialistic military rulers of Japan who are really betraying their own people. These rulers are taking our land and forcing narcotics on our people. If we oppose these militarists, some of the Japanese people will revolt and will be fighting as our allies and so will the people of Manchuria and the people of Korea. The Generalissimo has spent millions of dollars and a million soldiers to kill the Chinese, and yet acquiesces in the demands of Japan. He has slaughtered in the neighborhood of fifty thousand, many of whom are among the most sincere and self-sacrificing elements in China.

"We must get at the fundamental causes which produce ignorant Chinese who call themselves Communists. The basic causes are: famine, ignorance, poverty and exploitation. The fundamental problem is how to get the government to work for the people and to remove the conditions which breed Communists. The National Government has not tackled these problems to any appreciable extent. Instead they have spent millions of dollars for mammoth buildings in Nanking and to support the relatives of those who happen to be in power at the moment. This is not the way to regenerate China and never will be. The bureaucracy thus created is replete with graft."

At this point I requested the General to outline his economic program for the regeneration of China. In reply he declared:

"The people of China and the government must become one. Every effort must be made to educate the common people and to wake them up. Now if we really try to help the common people, to organize them, to make them think, we may be arrested or shot. The common people should have the power to check and supervise their own officials. They should be able to kick out bad government officers. It is not necessary to pattern after the West or after Soviet Russia but to give the people in the villages a Chinese method of supervising and controlling their own officials. The common people should have the right to express their own opinions, to criticize officials, in a word to have freedom of speech which they do not now have.

"What would be the result of such a policy? Take the matter of land. It is possible to take either a compromise policy or a revolutionary policy, but let the people themselves decide which it will be. In the one case all the land can be owned by the government; in the other case the government must take action to see to it that adequate provision is made for the poorer peasants. If the people really were organized to govern themselves, it would spell the end of opium and narcotics."

I inquired what the General thought of the foreign missionaries and their work. He was thoughtful for a moment and then said:

"In the old days the missionaries did a great deal of good. They helped in freeing the peasants from many superstitions such as feet-binding and they also aided in bringing education and medical help to the people. But today their chief emphasis is still preaching, reading the Bible and prayer. These may be important but if they do not respond to their present opportunity they will be missing a great chance.

Chinese Christians now often go abroad and then come back and support the tactics of a man like General Chiang Kia-shek, who is really doing harm to the country. The fundamental task of Christianity today should be to educate the people as to the realities of the actual government they are living under, kind of economic system they are being exploited by, and the necessity of securing social justice.

"Real Christians today should be doing what Jesus described in the judgment scene in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. They should be preventing exploitation and providing food, clothing and shelter for the people, and helping those who are imprisoned. For example, right now a hundred thousand refugees have been driven from their homes by the floods. (According to the official statistics of the government in August in Hupeh Province alone 7,000,000 men, women and children have been made homeless because their villages have been inundated.) Why can't the Christian churches permit these people to sleep in the church buildings until they are able to get other homes?

"If the Christians began to really help the common people to organize effectively for social justice, they would instantly feel the opposition of the Generalissimo. The fact is that most organizations which are trying to change the basis of exploitation in China either have to pervert their aims until they do not hit the basic problems, or they are driven underground. The Generalissimo does not even let his own party function. I, for instance, am on the Executive Committee of the Kuomintang Party, for which ostensibly the Generalissimo is working, and yet he does not observe its rules. He has not for some time called a meeting of the Executive Committee. If a meeting should be called and the members came some of them would be immediately arrested. The Generalissimo would rule with an iron hand. He would introduce a resolution with the remark, 'This will pass,' or 'There is no objection to this.' Even if he himself had a particular resolution passed, he would not feel the slightest obligation to observe it if he should later decide against it.

"Sooner or later the people will either overthrow Chiang Kai-shek or force him to oppose the demands of the Japanese imperialists. The people will not forever permit themselves to be betrayed."

It must be remembered that this interview represents to some degree the opposition to General Chiang Kai-shek. It does not represent the whole picture of what is happening in China, but it may interest American readers to hear the viewpoint of perhaps the strongest leader of the opposition.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Peacemakers

(To the Commissioners of the Nations)

For half a myriad of years
Ye have talked and talked of Peace,
But the grief of the World, its blood, its tears
Could never bring war to cease.

Smooth talkers, beautiful words ye have said.
They were words and nothing more;
A hundred million men are dead—
"The price"—with a shrug—"of war."

But now in these strong and splendid days
The reign of Peace draws near,
Since powder and bullets and guns and ships—
Not men—have grown too dear!

JULIAN M. DRACHMAN.

Pity Them

Pity the strong and pity the weak;
Pity the arrogant, pity the meek.

Pity the good and pity the bad;
Pity the happy and pity the sad.

Pity the bossman and pity the drudge;
Pity the prisoner, pity the judge.

Pity the victim they strap in the chair,
And the men at the switch, too callous to care.

Pity the ignorant, pity the wise;
The coward that lives and the brave man that dies.

Pity the rich and pity the poor;
Pity the illness and pity the cure.

Many—too many—blasted at birth;
Many—too many—crowding the earth!

Curse if you must and love if you can,
But pity the terrible fortune of Man.
Pity the great and pity the small;
Pity them, pity them, pity them all!

RALPH CHAPLIN.

Decade Passes On

Do decades never learn that war is HELL?
Still watching for demons and their kind
Who glory in the blare and tinselled shell
Enticing youth away when urge is blind.
A forte for slinging words to cheapen minds,
Forgetting stony paths our own have trod.
Emblazoned is the trail that winds and winds
Around the proven truths that we call God.

GRACE MINER LIPPINCOTT.

Medicine Chest

Religion is a balm that godly sirs
Apply for each unmoral stomach ache.
Humor's a sugar-coated pill we make
For almost every ailment that deters;
And jealousy is poison for the curs
That nip the heels with envy in their wake.
Regard the skull and crossbones. Do not take.
Tact is a salve Ma Wisdom often stirs
Expressly for the little cuts and sores;
And sympathy's an ointment for chapped hearts.
Self-confidence, a nervine for a test;
Ambition, tonic for the ever-goers;
Love, digitalis cure for Cupid's darts;
And death, a sedative that brings us rest.

ANN WINSLOW.

Beliefs

BELIEFS
Are rivers ever struggling
To reach the wide ocean of
TRUTH.

ROSA ZAGNONI MARINONI.

Modern Preaching and Jesus' Method

JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

Outcry for better preaching has become general. It may be suggestive in this connection to call attention to Jesus' method of preaching. Only by way of suggestion, many will doubtless believe, may this be profitable; his preaching method, they may insist, is not capable of general imitation. His uniqueness, so strongly insisted upon, extends to this function, and he must stand alone as a preacher as he does for such observers in so many other categories.

One of the most significant things said of Jesus is that he spake as one having authority, and not as the scribes. This seems to have defined most clearly his effectiveness as a preacher, for it is stated that for this reason the people heard him gladly. Perhaps what is the matter with the preaching of today is that it follows too closely the method of the scribes, and fails to embody the method of Jesus. The source of his inspiration in preaching was his own spiritual insights. When these ran counter to the prevailing religious conceptions of his day he did not hesitate to derive the doctrines he taught from the former source, correcting or contradicting the aberrations of the latter.

This was done in no spirit of iconoclastic defiance. He insisted that his aim was not to destroy, but to complete. There may be some difference of opinion as to what he meant when he declared that not one insignificant letter of the old law should pass until all be fulfilled, but it is clear that he maintained a profound sympathy with the deeper aims and purposes of the religious order in which he was reared, and that at the same time he confidently set aside or corrected in his preaching not merely incidental features of that system, but certain of its fundamentals.

When he declared on the authority of these direct spiritual insights that the old order of justice embodied in the formula, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, was abrogated and another radically different principle substituted, he was cutting into the heart of the system of Judaism. So deep, indeed, did this cutting go that to this day the Jew understands that to accept Jesus' body of doctrine and way of life, he must cease to be a Jew. Maybe this point should not be labored, for latterly Jesus is accepted as one of their outstanding prophets by certain types of Jews who still hold to Mosaism. In one of the New York synagogues, classes in Jesus' teachings are regularly and enthusiastically conducted, the wife of the presiding rabbi being the leader of the movement. It is noteworthy, however, that this synagogue stands out as the champion of reformed Judaism, inviting the censure, not to say reprobation, of strict orthodoxy.

But however questionable it may be to whittle down the point too fine, it is clear that Jesus boldly challenged religious ideals and practices of his day which were out of accord with the authority derived from his own spiritual insights. This practice is not generally followed by preachers today. Most sermons are enslaved to the text. Little preaching musters courage other than that of the scribes. To be sure, the old-fashioned expository sermon, to which the fathers were so devoutly beholden, is now generally in disuse, but the text still holds sway; ancient scriptures still dominate most of the preaching.

It is true that many a text is used simply as a point of departure, and, once it has been left behind, the sermon goes flitting here and there, like the dove from the ark, seeking rest for the sole of its foot. But this practice only accentuates the weakness of the scribe's style; the preacher is only blundering the method to which he pays lip-service.

Consistently adopted, Jesus' method would challenge, in the light of modern insights upon truth, the now ancient teachings of Jesus himself, just as he was moved to challenge the ancient scriptures of his day; his teachings are now among the sayings of those "of old." Those today who ascribe finality to his sayings, maintaining that they are the last word upon any subject which he touched upon, and that nothing can ever be taken from them or added to them, will not, of course, presume to apply his method of preaching to Jesus' own teachings. But others may see in the method's application a way of highly honoring him and his message. They may construe his use of the method as its commendation to those who carry forward the light which he transmitted.

And, as a matter of fact, a frank and open application of this method in the recent controversy between fundamentalists and modernists would have greatly clarified the situation, and have saved the listeners-in a deal of bewilderment. These listeners have heard ardent fundamentalists and apparently outspoken modernists preaching opposing doctrines from the same scriptures. The naive hearer knows that both cannot be correct, and he has been inclined, therefore, to discount both, if not to desert all preaching.

The forced ingenuity of modernist preachers in giving old texts a new twist, to derive a new meaning more comfortably or rationally applicable to modern situations, has not proved a source of strength. It is quite possible that the people would have heard them more gladly if they had frankly declared that scriptural teachings, including some of Jesus' own statements, are inadequate and misleading if applied to modern social and personal problems, and had dared to interpret truth for today on the authority of new and enlightened spiritual insights.

The point might be almost endlessly illustrated. It would seem to many hearers much more effective when a preacher is discoursing upon the text, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's," if he would state that on the occasion when these words were uttered Jesus was matching wits with a quibbler. He was refusing to touch an exceedingly hot potato which a heckler was trying to hand him.

For some reason Jesus made no attempt to define the obligations of a citizen; he consistently evaded political issues. When he could no longer escape the tax-collector he sent Simon Peter angling for a fish in the mouth of which reposed a coin of sufficient value to pay off both his and Peter's debt. This procedure can scarcely be commended as a universal solution of the taxpayer's problem today. Jesus left the student of his teachings in confusion even in the profoundest concerns of social organization and social obligation. While many moderns are deriving inspiration for their "social gospel" from repeated references to the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven on earth, yet

the extreme millennialism of the closing chapters of Matthew's gospel are to be reckoned with. It is impossible rationally to reconcile these two concepts. Only scribes' jugglery can successfully resolve their incongruity, and it is no wonder that the modernist preacher is often driven into a corner by the fundamental literalist when the modernist, too, protests his devotion to literalism.

However that matter may stand, it is clear that no such clean-cut demarcation between political and religious obligations in a democratic community can be drawn, as that indicated in Jesus' countering upon his heckler. Nor can the preacher in a modern free society be permitted to evade a clear issue after this fashion. What immeasurable embarrassment and confusion the American preacher of today would be saved if he would boldly adopt Jesus' own homiletical method, and assert the palpable inadequacy of Jesus' teachings in politics, in economics, in social organization, and in countless relations in which the citizen of a modern democracy finds himself! The insights required to guide through the ethical maze thus created must come from a different source, and by a method much more direct and imperious than can be the nice attempts of the scribe to formulate injunctions from ancient scriptures. Jesus did not live in our kind of society, and he could not contemplate the relationships and social obligations involved in a democratic community.

For reasons which may be accepted as sufficient Jesus personally adopted a mode of life which one of his great admirers, Dr. Frank Crane, was accustomed to declare to be that of "a common, ordinary tramp." I shall never forget the sniff, almost the snort, which came from my much-beloved mother-in-law, when I read one morning in our family circle, the scriptural injunction to "consider the lilies of the field . . . take no thought for the morrow." She was an eminently devout woman, but she had given birth to ten children, and had been left a widow when half of them were still dependent. She had struggled through the ordeal of providing food and shelter and respectable clothing for her brood in a frontier community. For anybody to tell her to take no thought for the morrow was tantamount to inviting her to join the society of the slovenly tenant farmer's slattern wife who rode about from farm to farm in a ramshackle covered wagon swarming with her rag-tag progeny.

The need of inspired preaching today is a truism. Technicians in almost every department of our social organization stand bewildered before the moral implications and consequences of their art. Politics are in such mess that many politicians are in revolt against conditions of their own creation, and which they find themselves unable to correct. Lawyers have thrown up their hands in despair before the ghastly travestv upon justice which much of the present-day court procedure involves. Engineers behold their magnificent technological creation becoming a portentous Frankenstein, threatening to overwhelm the very social structure which it was designed to bless. Financiers and industrial magnates will not soon be permitted to forget their confessed impotence before problems of their own creation, as the depression's full flood swept over the community.

There is just one possible resolution of this ominous confusion, and that is a clear-visioned moral sense spread throughout the American community, which will enable the whole people to stand forth in the majesty of the great moral imperatives, and order the ways of technicians in all departments. Experts without moral initiative or guidance are bound to run amuck. An enlightened and conscienceful American public must call upon its technical forces, not to dictate, and evade, and explain why certain needful ministries to the community welfare cannot be performed, but to be told with a finality born of the people's clarified moral convictions what must be done, and to be charged with the duty of finding the way by which this needful shall be done.

And, as the people's guides in the superlatively important matter of shaping these imperious convictions, we have scribes feebly repeating from countless pulpits the formulas of ancient scriptures! Few of them seem to understand how wearied the average layman is of being assured that our society needs to "get back to God"; of being told that in the teachings of Jesus, stereotyped in the first century, there is to be found the all-sufficient and all-comprehending guide through the mazes of twentieth century problems; of hearing that in their ancient scriptures, signed, sealed and closed to all addition and subtraction centuries ago, are bound up the moral energies designed to serve all generations for all time.

How we do need inspired preachers! Preachers who will know what they are talking about and will say what drives forthright into the living issues of human weal today. Preachers who care less what Matthew, Mark, Luke and John said or did not say in the first century, and who care more what Tom, Dick, Harry and the Hon. John Doe think and say and do in their struggle for the good society of our own time. Preachers who will not exhaust their ingenuity in extracting new and bizarre renderings from ancient scriptures, in the feeble attempt to make them mean something to their hearers in our American churches, but will reserve some of their resources for direct attack upon the social problems with which their hearers are immediately concerned. Preachers who will derive their spiritual insights from first-hand knowledge acquired in fields where technicians stand bewildered before moral problems transcending their technique, and who will help to equip the American public for confident attack upon these problems for which our whole social creation waits with groanings now so loudly uttered that even scribes ought to be able to hear.

Tut! tut! Nobody should say such things about the Lord's anointed. Perhaps our scribes in American pulpits are simply saying and doing what the schools of the scribes in which they have been trained have taught them. Perhaps we ought to be grateful for those occasional flashes of first-hand insight which some of these preachers do display, conscious that such come as by a miracle from their source. But when one contemplates what light might break, if an order of preachers should appear who would lay aside for once and for all the scribes' devices, and should attack the great spiritual need of our day first hand and in the majesty of their own moral apprehensions, one cannot help but become a bit enthusiastic.

Sanctions: Are They Right Or Wrong?*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Our first step is to understand what we mean by the principle of Sanctions. The word is an old one, but its use in this connection is somewhat new. Or rather may I say that the word in this connection is a new one, but the idea which it is intended to convey is very old. By Sanctions we mean an assurance or guaranty that a rule adopted, a contract signed, an agreement entered upon, will be lived up to by the parties concerned with the the arrangement. The assurance usually takes the form of a penalty imposed upon the violator of an accord by all those who are injured by the violation. Thus, a number of athletic teams organize a league for the mutual pleasure and profit of playing a game, and they draw up a set of rules and regulations to govern their association with one another. In these rules and regulations it is provided that any team which fails to live up to the terms as thus agreed upon will be excluded from the league, and denied the privileges of the organization. No team will play a game and share the profits with the offender. This is a Sanction.

The lawyers of a community get together and organize a society known as a Bar Association. All members of the profession are invited to join this association on the basis of a code of professional conduct, and it is stipulated that any violation of this code may lead to exclusion not only from the association but from the bar itself. The offending lawyer in such case will not be recognized by his colleagues, nor even allowed to practice in the courts. This is a Sanction.

The citizens of a state enact a law for the safeguarding of the common security and welfare, and the law expressly defines penalties for its violation. If a person wantonly or deliberately breaks the law, he will be punished by fine or imprisonment, and by the loss of citizenship, or, in the case of an alien, by deportation. This is a Sanction.

Now it is a Sanction, or Sanctions, of this kind, in the world at large, that are today under discussion as the most pressing international problem of the hour. On January 28, 1919, certain nations of the world organized on the basis of a Covenant the League of Nations, which now has fifty-eight members. This League was established—to quote the words of the Covenant—"in order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security." To this end, the end of getting rid of war, the signatories are bound in the Covenant to various agreements—among others, to regard "any war or threat of war" as "a matter of concern to the whole League," to submit to arbitration "any dispute likely to lead to a rupture" between them and "in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators," to submit to the Council of the League "any dispute likely to lead to a rupture which is not submitted to arbitration." Then follows the remarkable Article 16 which provides three things: first, that "should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants, . . . all other members of the League . . . undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade and financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking state, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse"; second, that "it shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend . . . what effective military, naval, or air forces the members of the League shall contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League"; and, third, that "any member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a member of the League." These are Sanctions.

Now, if we study these Sanctions, as laid down by the League of Nations, we will see that they are substantially of three kinds. There are economic Sanctions, military Sanctions, and outlawry Sanctions. Of these, the least important, it seems to me, is the outlawry Sanction which provides that an offending member may be banished from the League—the least important because the least effective! The League of Nations, unfortunately, is not strong enough today, not central enough to the world's affairs, to make it a matter of any great concern to any nation as to whether it is a member of the League or not. There may come a time when the League of Nations will be so powerful that exclusion from its membership would be as disastrous as exclusion of any one of the states of the United States from the American union. But at a time when three of the greatest nations of the world—Japan, Germany and the United States—are outside the membership of the League, and when the chief problem is not that of asking nations to leave but of persuading them to come in or to stay in, this threat of banishment is not a Sanction of any serious importance. On the contrary, in the present crisis, it is Italy which is threatening to leave the League, rather than the League which is threatening to make her leave. Not until membership in the League, at least for the great Powers, has become an asset and not a liability, a privilege rather than a responsibility, will this Sanction against war be anything more than "a scrap of paper." When that time comes, if it ever does come, I believe that the possibility of outlawry from a world society of nations will be one of the most effective, as well as one of the most righteous, guaranties of peace.

This leaves but two Sanctions for our consideration—economic Sanctions and military Sanctions. Of these two, I believe that military Sanctions, as a means of preventing war, are absolutely impossible, for the simple reason that such Sanctions are themselves war. They are but the latest version, so to speak, of "the war to end war," which was fought out with such inglorious results in the great conflict of 1914.

Let us consider, for a moment, what is contemplated in this business of military Sanctions. Here is a nation which has gone to war with another nation in violation of its solemn compact to

[*An address spoken by Mr. Holmes at the Community Church, New York City; also at the Boston Community Church.—EDITOR.]

keep the peace. Under this idea of military Sanctions, it is now proposed that the other nations of the world shall get together to consider, as Article 16 of the League Covenant puts it, "what effective military, naval, or air forces the members . . . shall contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League." Note, if you please, that these "armed forces" are to be *"used"* —used, of course, against the nation which is making war upon its neighbor. But when "military, naval, or air forces" are *"used,"* what is this but war? It is true that the armaments in this case are used not in the selfish interest of one nation but in the mutual interest of all, but the result is none the less a war. It is true that the fighting is not aggressive fighting for territory and booty, but definitely defensive fighting for the maintenance of peace, but fighting is none the less fighting. I can imagine that when the armies of the associated powers move against the offending nation, and their navies blockade his coasts, and their aeroplanes drop bombs upon his cities, all in armed sanction of the Covenant, it will make little difference to those who suffer whether the war is of one kind or of another. To the soldier hanging on the barbed-wire of the trenches, to the sailor drowning in the sinking submarine, to the mother witnessing the explosion that wrecks her home and annihilates her child, pain is pain, and blood is blood, and death is death, and war is war! A military Sanction is simply one more endeavor to sanctify the war process, that is all, and I tell you it cannot be done.

What is involved in this idea of military Sanctions is an extension of war, and a hardening of its iron grip upon mankind. The moment a single nation, for any reason, runs amuck and starts a fight, then under this principle of military Sanctions, all the other nations are bound to jump in, and thus make the fight a universal instead of a limited calamity. For years the peacemakers of the world have been exhausting every means at their disposal of localizing a war when it breaks out in any part of the world, as firemen try to localize a fire to the building in which it starts and thus save a whole city from being devoured by a conflagration. The only reason why the Great War of 1914 was so incredible a tragedy, the supreme catastrophe of modern times, is to be found in the fact that the statesmen of the day not only failed to prevent the war, but, having failed to prevent it, they likewise failed to confine it to a border struggle between Serbia and Austria. It got away from them, and thus engulfed mankind. And now it is proposed, through the device of military Sanctions, to make every such war, whether it starts in Serbia, or Manchukuo, or Ethiopia, a universal affair. A league of nations, in other words, geared to military Sanctions, is nothing under heaven but a guaranty, in so far as statesmanship can give a guaranty, that every war shall be a world war. The Italian war in Abyssinia, followed by the mobilization of the British fleet in the Mediterranean, would long since have become a European and then a world war, had it not been for the breakdown of the Geneva Covenant. Italy violated its every pledge to the League of Nations—but the League took not a single step toward using any "effective military, naval, or air forces" against the offender. If this means that we are beginning to recognize that war is war, even when it is used as a sanction of peace, it may be that we are nearer our goal of peace than we imagine.

This brings us to the question of economic Sanctions—by which we mean the use of financial and commercial controls to the end of peace. There are those opposed to this type of Sanctions for the same reason that they are opposed to military Sanctions—on the ground, namely, that such Sanctions constitute an act of war, or at least contain within themselves the seeds of war. George Lansbury, of England, took this position when he resigned the leadership of the British Labor Party on the issue of Sanctions, either military or economic. And he was right in the sense that in England at that time it was proposed that economic Sanctions against Italy should be enforced, if necessary, by the power of the military—in this case, by the English fleet then mobilized at Malta, Gibraltar and Alexandria. Such mingling of military and economic forces was bound in the end to make war, and might well therefore be itself described as an act of war. But economic Sanctions are not necessarily entangled with armies and navies. They need not, and indeed should not, be enforced by military action. Economic Sanctions are to be judged upon their merits as a control and a direction of national policy to the end of serving national and international interests of human welfare.

Nobody objects to such control and direction of national policy in time of peace—not, at least, on the ground that it involves an act of war. When a country imposes a tariff upon the goods of another country, it is not written in any book nor believed by any public opinion that the first country is thereby going to war against the second. When the United States declines to give credits or loans to some South American country that is swept by civil conflict or lies helpless in the hands of some irresponsible dictator, this action is nowhere interpreted as a declaration or even a suggestion of war. When the United States refused for a period of years, for reasons good and sufficient to her government, to do business with Russia, there were plenty of people ready to declare that this policy was stupid, spiteful, unwise, unwarranted, even unfriendly, but I have yet to hear of anybody who regarded it as involving hostilities against the Soviets. The boycott against Germany, sustained by millions of people today, not only in America but in Europe, has been widely denounced not only as folly but as madness, but as yet to be described as war. If such economic policies are acceptable, or at least accepted, when used in some national interest of security, or power, or advantage, why should they not be similarly accepted when used in the international interest of peace? We know what war is—an attack upon a nation, with weapons of force and violence, to the end of destroying her property, killing her citizens, and breaking her power. Why should economic Sanctions be confused, either actually or potentially, with such a phenomenon, especially when these Sanctions are definitely used to prevent it, or, if it cannot be prevented, to end it without delay?

So far from regarding economic Sanctions as

an act of war, I for one must insist upon regarding them as an alternative to war—the only alternative to a war which is sure to come if economic Sanctions be not applied. For what are we going to do when a nation like Japan or Italy violates its solemn pledge to peace, and proceeds to make a war which throws the whole world into confusion and disorder? We cannot pick up the gauntlet of battle and fight ourselves, for this, as we have seen, would only compound the crime which we would prevent or overcome. But does this mean that we must do nothing in opposition to this offense, and, by doing nothing, perhaps even aid and abet the offender in his evil-doing? Is there no effectual alternative to armed resistance but inaction and acquiescence? Mahatma Gandhi, of India, did not think so. He met this predicament by an act of statesmanship which was as wise as it was idealistic. He would not take up arms against the British Crown, even for so sacred a boon as liberty. His principles of non-violence forbade such policy. But neither would he surrender to the Crown—give up the fight, and accept a condition of subservience to alien rule. His principles of resistance forbade such policy. But surrender to subjection was only one alternative to violent resistance. Another alternative, destined forever to be associated with Gandhi's name, was non-violent resistance. He would resist the *Raj* by organizing his fellow-countrymen to withdraw relations with the Empire. At the heart of his non-violent movement of revolt were economic Sanctions, which took the form of a boycott of English goods, especially of English cotton, intended for the Indian market, and an embargo on Indian goods intended for the English market. When Gandhi heaped up great piles of English cotton in Bombay, and burned them in a solemn ceremony of public sacrifice, he showed the power as well as the drama of economic Sanctions.

It is Sanctions of this kind which I believe can be effectively and righteously applied to nations which break the bond of peace. Once it is understood that these Sanctions are to be sustained by no appeal to arms, I doubt if there will be any disagreement with this opinion, except perhaps on the question as to how far such Sanctions may be applied.

Thus, we will all agree that no loans or credits should be granted to any nation which goes wantonly to war against its neighbor. Refusal of financial assistance is certainly a direct way of stopping a war which cannot long continue without it. Furthermore, there is the sober fact that loans or credits cannot be granted to a belligerent nation without the lender or creditor becoming immediately a partner in the war which he is presumably desiring to prevent. If I invest money in an enterprise, I am supporting this enterprise, seeking profit from it, wishing success to it. In the same way, if England or America were to float a loan for Italy at this moment, either nation would be taking its share of responsibility, as well as credit, in the invasion of Ethiopia. When America actually furnished money to the Allies in the war against Germany, we became thereby so inextricably entangled in the war that active military participation in it became in the end inevitable. The refusal of loans and credits, in other words, signifies opposition to a war and a desire to stop it, as their bestowal assuredly signifies approval of a war and a desire to support it.

A second economic Sanction, to which we must all agree, is the refusal of arms and munitions to a nation engaged in war. To furnish such arms and munitions is to make an even more direct contribution to belligerency than to furnish money. It is to supply, at first hand, the weapons of destruction without which the war cannot be continued a single hour. If there is anything in the world more ironical, and also dishonest, than the spectacle of a nation professing to believe in peace and pretending to serve the interests of peace, and all the time sustaining huge munition plants which will supply the hideous materials of war to any nation which cares to use them for attack upon its neighbor, I for one do not chance to know what it may be. I imagine that men are weary of this thing, even to the point of disgust and horror, especially after the disclosures in recent years of the nature of the satanic business carried on by our modern "merchants of death." In the future, if not actually today, any country which undertakes to go to war must supply its own machine-guns, its own bombing-planes, its own tanks and submarines and poisonous gases. On the international trade in such merchandise there will be placed a ban which will represent the enlightened and determined conscience of mankind.

But if arms and munitions must be forbidden, why not the raw materials which go into the production of such weapons? Is there not here suggested a third economic Sanction which challenges unanimous support? A few weeks after the President, acting under the power granted to him by Congress in the famous Neutrality Act, had banned the sale of all arms and munitions to either Italy or Ethiopia, it was discovered that ships in New York harbor were being loaded to the gunwales with scrap-iron for Italy. This was an anomalous, not to say ridiculous, situation. For scrap-iron, next only perhaps to dynamite, is undoubtedly the most essential ingredient that is involved in the manufacture of explosives. And here we were shipping tons of this iron to Italy at the very moment when we were setting ourselves to live under a ban of neutrality against both the belligerent powers in northeast Africa! All of which means that an economic Sanction against arms must be supplemented by a similar Sanction against the iron, the ores, the nitrates, and all other substances which contribute to the production or the use of arms! We must ban the raw materials as well as the finished articles of warfare.

To these three economic Sanctions—against credits, arms and the materials of arms—there can be no reasonable opposition. Trouble begins only when we come to things which enter into the business of peace as well as of war. Cotton, for example, is as necessary to the manufacture of explosives as nitro-glycerine; but cotton must also be used to clothe the bodies of human beings. Steel is basic to the construction of tanks and battleships, cannon and fortifications; but steel is also basic to the construction of railroads, office buildings, automobiles, and the myriad machines of industry. Oil is the fuel of war, but it is also the fuel of peace. Food is as indispensable to soldiers as their guns and cartridge belts. Napoleon said

that "an army travels on its stomach"—by which he meant that an army can move only as fast and as far as it can be fed by its commissary department! But food is also indispensable to women and children and the aged. Italy cannot live without the importation of vast quantities of food which, in the present situation, must go equally to military and civilians. When the English fleet flung a blockade about Germany as a means of defeating the enemy in the Great War, it starved millions of the population at home before it reached the soldiers at the front at all. What are we going to do with such articles as these which are necessary to life, and thus belong quite as much to the routine of peace as to the emergency of war? If we want to stop the war, then it is obvious that we must in some way ban these things. But if we ban them, in terms of a Sanction upon a belligerent nation on behalf of peace, our act will be effective primarily at the expense of the innocent! To such a dilemma I have seen only one satisfactory answer, and that is the one offered by the National Peace Conference in its proposed redraft of the existing neutrality law of this country. The Conference, in addition to the present embargo on loans and credits and the further embargo on munitions, would also put general raw materials, such as cotton, oil, and food products, which are useful in war but also in peace, on a definite quota basis, in accordance with the pre-war trade of immediately preceding years. Such provision would protect the non-combatant population of the belligerent country. If they suffered, it would be because of the action of their own government and not of ours.

Such is the program of economic Sanctions which I believe must be adapted to the modern world in lieu of any other effective means of preserving peace against the depredations of bandit nations. This program is justified not merely by the dictates of expediency, but quite as much by the standards of morality. The Sanctions involved are right as adjudged by the principle of self-respect, and by every ideal of a free, ordered, and happy world. They are properly being applied to Italy today, as they should properly have been applied to Japan yesterday. Not otherwise, amid the complexities and confusions, the hazards and dangers of contemporary life, can our civilization hope longer to survive. At their best, these Sanctions may save our world.

But suppose, as a matter of fact, that the outcome of these Sanctions proves to be the worst and not the best! Let us imagine that, in the present crisis, the League of Nations imposed an oil embargo upon Italy, and that Mussolini actually carried out his monstrous threat that he would regard such an embargo as an act of war, and proceed accordingly. Would not this result be a disaster comparable to the Ethiopian disaster itself, and would it not have to be met by military Sanctions, and perhaps even by war?

I cannot so believe! What if Mussolini should go utterly mad, and in a fury of desperation make war not merely upon Ethiopia but upon the world? His initial attack could do only a very limited amount of damage—an amount in no way commensurate with the enormous wreckage which would follow upon an answer of his challenge by force of arms. Surely there would be nothing gained, and everything lost, in accepting a world war as dictated by the exigencies of Il Duce's rule. If Mussolini should decide to fight against economic Sanctions, as a maniac might fight against a strait-jacket, why should we not ourselves refuse to fight, and draw the strait-jacket a little tighter? Granted catastrophic disaster in his first attack—the sinking, let us say, of a large portion of the English fleet in the Mediterranean, perhaps the loss of Malta, and an uprising in Egypt—how long could the Italian dictator sustain his attack, and how far could he extend it, in the face of economic Sanctions imposed with a rigor and a vigor unknown before? Would not the oil embargo alone defeat him, and in a few weeks bring him to his knees? A little loss in the beginning, insignificant as compared with the titanic losses incident to a war ruthlessly sustained upon both sides—and the crisis would be over! Economic Sanctions would have done their work. Mussolini's only chance, in such an issue, would spring from an imperfect application of the sanctions policy by his opponents. If the nations did not hold together in banning the materials without which an Italian army cannot fight, or even live—if some of the nations supplied arms and oil and money, as some of them are now supplying such things in repudiation or neglect of their solemn obligations to the League—then Italy could carry on her world war, as she is now carrying on her African war. But this would be a failure not of Sanctions but of the nations imposing, or pretending to impose, Sanctions. The flow of materials must be stopped, if the war is to be stopped. Any hole in the dike, letting through any trickle of supplies, will release the flood that will engulf the hope of peace. All of which means that a policy of economic Sanctions can alone be effective on a basis of common action to a common end! It is with the idea that economic Sanctions, if applied at all, shall be applied by all, that I have argued for the Sanctions policy as feasible and right.

But this is not the final word upon the problem of Sanctions. Not yet have we reared our last and strongest bulwark against the menace of war. The Sanctions which we have thus far been talking about are all negative Sanctions. They are an attempt to guarantee a status of peace by imposing disabilities and penalties upon a nation which violates the compact of peace. But why not guarantee this status of peace by meeting positively the conditions of frustration and inequality which make it seem desirable or even necessary to some nation to upset the status? In addition to Sanctions, in other words, which meet negatively and therefore repressively the conditions of war after war has broken out, why not Sanctions which meet positively and therefore constructively the conditions of war before it has broken out? There are exigencies of circumstance, as we know to our cost, which make for war in the case of certain powerful, expanding, and ill-favored nations. Why not meet these exigencies now, in a world conference of peace before, instead of after, the fighting, by a series of Sanctions, or international reforms, which may secure for the nations of the world what the Constitutional Convention of 1787 secured for the

divided and distracted states of colonial America—namely "the common welfare"?

I suggest three positive Sanctions, or measures of high statesmanship, for the guaranty of peace to our disordered world:

First, an equitable provision for the expansion of the populations of vital and growing nations! Fundamental to this whole question is birth control, through the operation of which populations may be controlled as we control the expansion of steam in a boiler. But it will be centuries before man gains mastery of his reproductive processes. Meanwhile, in nations like Japan and Italy and Germany, partly through the deliberate encouragement of the governments of these powers, the increase in population is going on. In Japan alone a million persons a year are added to a population already subsisting upon the inadequate soil of a volcanic archipelago. To hold this population tight within its national borders is to invite explosion. Only by liberating the tides of life can war be avoided and peace assured. Men and land must somehow be brought together. This is the first of the constructive Sanctions against war.

Second, as important as the suitable distribution of population, is the equitable distribution of economic privilege. We have moved today, whether we like it or not, into an industrial age. In such an age, a nation, if it would not forego all opportunities of progress, must have two things. First, access to raw materials; and, second, access to foreign markets. As things are now, the natural resources of the planet, as necessary to life as the air we breathe or the water we drink, are held in the selfish clutches of a few great powers which arrived early upon the scene. From all other powers these resources are cut off, and to this extent at least the conditions of life denied. The same is true of markets, which through tariff barriers at home and colonial possessions abroad are held as the private property of those who would use them in their own exclusive interest. Under such conditions, peace is impossible. Our whole international economy, in other words, is a preparation and thus a prelude of war. No Sanction can avail against it except the recognition of the principle of common wealth for common use.

Third, there is the Sanction of disarmament. By some means we must strip the nations of the arms which make them foes. To declare that these arms, on land and sea and in the air, are the cause of war is superficial. To recognize that they are the provocation to war is fundamental. No one thing so surely contributed to peace in this federation of states which is the United States as the denial to all the states of arms as weapons against each other. No one thing so surely contributed to war in the crisis of 1914 as the menacing armaments of the nations which were in controversy. Peace can be assured only through the denial of armies and navies to the nations, for an armed nation, like an armed bandit, is a peril to peace and order. So long as international conferences on this question, like the present London Conference, do nothing or worse than nothing, we cannot hope to get rid of war. The Sanction of disarmament is essential.

Such is the truth about Sanctions—negative Sanctions and positive Sanctions. That Sanctions of this kind—such policies of constructive statesmanship as these which I have named—can be achieved only by the glad accord of nations is obvious. But, let us not fool ourselves!—it is only by such glad accord, and by such cooperative action as such accord makes possible, that any peace can be attained. It is not the least of the arguments for Sanctions that they present opportunities and disciplines of cooperation. mutual action, unity of sentiment and purpose, which are themselves the very soul of peace. For peace is no lifeless state of inertia and torpidity. It is no absorption of vitality into some Nirvana of dreamless slumber. It is true that a great conqueror is said to have "made a desert and called it peace." But peace is not a desert, nor yet a dearth. Peace is the accordant action of the processes of life to creative ends. It is the peace of the body when each organ is functioning with every other organ in the mutual service of the organism. It is the peace of the heavens when star moves with star to make that "music of the spheres" which is celestial harmony. It is the peace of the heart when every energy is beating, like the pulsations of a machine, in the soft rhythm of productive action. It is the peace of the world when all men as brothers are working each for all and all for each.

It is because Sanctions, as imposed and sustained by many nations, are a first step toward this peace of common effort toward a common life, that they are good. Rude and crude as they may be, they none the less forecast and prepare for the coming of that happy day

> "When the war drums throb no longer
> and the battleflags are furled,
> In the Parliament of Man, the Federation
> of the World."

As to War

What else can you expect of nimbus clouds
But rain? And gospel holds that, as one sows
So must he reap, the producers of shrouds
Believe the mass was born to dying throes.
They whose aims are nourished and fed by gain
Will exalt war and its grim fruits of death,
Will coin hymns of praise to the God of pain,
And foul the meek with gifts of poison breath.

The fife and drum will stir the savage breast;
And they who live by profit of the sword
Will spread the seed of hate among the rest,
While pointing out the teachings of the Lord.
The men whose hearts are in the money-bag
Are Judases who hide behind the flag.

JACK GREENBERG.

Travel Letters—III

In Japan

ALSON H. ROBINSON

When we left Kyoto two days ago I thought our friends Dr. and Mrs. E. S. Cobb, with whom we had been stopping, seemed puzzled. Here we were in the very midst of the most colorful section of Japan, rich in a tradition dating from the eighth century, and after three or four days were getting out. Here it was that the Emperor made his residence until 1869 when the Imperial Court was moved to Tokyo.

Everything Japanese is at its best in Kyoto. If one happens to be interested in the contrast between Emperors and Shoguns he will find satisfaction in their respective palaces. If he cares to launch upon that boundless sea of distinction between the forty-nine varieties of Buddhism, Kyoto is the place to begin; in addition to finding here numerous sectarian headquarters. Religiously Kyoto is Boston, Salt Lake City and Los Angeles all rolled up together. I thought I knew something about religion, at least in its outward manifestation. With numerous visits to the great cathedrals of Europe, with some slight contact with the Greek church in Russia before the liquidation of their buildings, with a mental picture of what Roman Catholicism has done in Mexico, I thought I knew the story. Well, now I know, even in this brief and casual contact with these numberless shrines and temples of the Shinto and Buddhist religions, that I have to "give it up."

I had started to write about the glories of Kyoto. If one wants to see Japanese gardens in their loveliest arrangement, or the most extraordinary juxtaposition of a Roman Catholic Church under the shadow of a great newspaper building modern to the extent of having enormous mural paintings on its outside walls; if he is interested in contemporary Japanese education at its best or the cooperative enterprises of Kagawa functioning either in city or country, Kyoto is the place. Is it any wonder that our friends, the Cobbs, were amused and baffled by this typical demonstration of American globe trotting? We had spent less than a fortnight among the most active and resourceful people of the Far East. Friendly doors had been opened to us both by foreigners and native Japanese. We were just beginning to get the slightest inkling of what it was all about when we packed our bags and were on our way.

We were genuinely sorry, but there were reasons which seemed adequate to us. In the first place, if we are to be out of India by the middle of April and meanwhile visit China, the Philippines, the Dutch East Indies, the Malay States, Siam and French Indo-China, we can't spend as much of our time as we would wish in any one country. We are anxious to get on to China. After all, Japan culturally is the child of China, and we may understand better what we have seen by going to the fountain head. In the second place, we were cold. I was born in northern Maine, and thought I knew what cold weather is. But once again I "give it up." They say this has been the coldest winter Japan has had for many years. I hope so. The *Tokyo News* reports more than three hundred deaths from exposure in the capital alone during the past month. None of the houses is adequately heated; how the people stand it is too much for me. Manifestly we are here at the wrong season. With the enormous number of cherry and plum trees growing in the finest bit of soil, spring and summer must be periods of indescribable beauty. But they're bare and cold now, and because we think we have a good excuse we hurry on to milder climate. Before we go, let me select a few random impressions about the people and the conditions under which they live.

In Mrs. Lindbergh's charming and penetrating account of her visit, she substantiates the reputation of these people for courtesy. The eternal gentleman she calls the Japanese. Even in these few days we could tell lots of stories of a similar nature. At Kobe one of our bags failed to arrive. We had five checks and four suitcases. I must have looked silly holding that fifth slip of pasteboard. What had happened to the bag nobody knew. The porter spoke no English, and of course we did not know his language. But we followed obediently to the office of the station master. As we sat around his desk, cups of steaming tea appeared as by magic. But I did not want tea; I wanted the lost bag. There was instruction by the station master as to the correct manner of drinking tea. At last there was a telephone call. Then there was more instruction in broken but quite intelligible English as to the charm of the city and the hotels best suited to our needs. Within five minutes of the time we had made our decision, the hotel porter was at our service. Almost simultaneously another door opened and in walked the lost bag. How it was done I can't imagine. But just thirty-two minutes and sixteen seconds after the disappearance of the bag we were again living happily, escorted to our taxi, and bowed away as though we were members of the Imperial Family itself.

Some of our friends will ask how the Japanese people look in the mass. Well, the mass is great, but the individual is very small. For that matter the country itself is small. Compare an area of 260,000 odd square miles with the more than 3,000,000 of our own country, and you have an indication of the difference in size. Like the country, the people as individuals look tiny. My daughter is somewhat above the average height of American girls. I imagine she appears colossal to the girls here. In any event they look up to her towering height, and giggle. She has afforded constant amusement, and played the part with good sportsmanship. Western dress is much less in evidence than we had expected. In the private schools we have visited, both boys and girls wear European clothes. But after they grow up they return to native costume for the most part; and some of it is very lovely and very graceful. Shall I ever forget the sound of clogs! They all wear them, mostly wooden ones. How they keep them on, much less walk in them, is another mystery. But I shall never forget the sound of clogs.

Concerning the life and labor of the people there are perhaps two aspects which impress us as casual and superficial observers. The first is overcrowding, the second the depressed standards of labor. I am told that as to the former it would be well for me to reserve my adjectives until we reach China and try to make my way through certain sections of the ancient city of Peiping. Maybe so, but if human beings can be jammed together any closer than they are in the factory district

north of Tokyo, which by the way is now the third largest city in the world, I can't imagine how it can be done. They haven't the slighest privacy even from the street. Only paper screens in dilapidated condition protect them from cold and the public gaze. Here and there a tiny brazier or a feeble bonfire in the narrow street provides scant protection from the winter's cold. And yet these houses are clean and the people are clean, jammed together though they are. And as a means of compensation if they can find barely a few inches of unoccupied ground, out of it you will see growing a diminutive pine tree or bamboo sprout. It is the irrepressible Japanese love of beauty which, thank goodness, western industrialism has but slightly tempered.

We had a glimpse of the way they work when our ship docked at Nagasaki this morning. Great barges filled with coal began to close in upon the ship. As they came nearer we discovered to our amazement that most of the workers were women. A few men shovelled the coal into tiny wicker baskets and the women handed them along chain fashion to the coal bunkers of the ship. It seemed primitive. The simplest machinery designed to do that sort of work couldn't cost much. But apparently human labor is still cheaper than the machine.

Just a word about the military. We don't see it, but we feel it. We were surprised to see so few soldiers, none in fact. Where was this colossal army of Japan? In Manchuria, fighting the Chinese? Not at all, explained Mr. Hugh Byas, Tokyo correspondent of the New York *Times*. The annual conscript draft had just gone into training, and were not ready for public inspection. Most of them had worn clogs all their lives, and the army boots hurt their feet. They would first have to get used to some of the refinements of modern military attire, and then with what delight and admiration they would be presented to a populace prepared for their reception! As to how we have felt the military; how the Japanese people feel it, and how the world feels it, well that's another and slightly longer story. Whatever else the military may have done, its bungling fiasco at London for instance, it appears to have made no inroads upon the friendliness and courtesy of these people, and we're genuinely sorry to leave.

The Study Table

A Great American on America

WHAT DOES AMERICA MEAN? *By Alexander Meiklejohn. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. 271 pp. $3.00.*

It is a long time since we have read as constructively stimulating a volume as this recent thesis by the Director of the San Francisco School of Social Studies. Offhand we can think of no volume that for timely driving home of saving truths has thrilled us so much since 1915 when we read John Haynes Holmes' *New Wars For Old*. In fact, we might call this book, "A New Call to America to Be Her Old Self."

America, of course, means liberty, but "Liberty Is Not for Property." To understand what liberty really meant to our American forefathers, we must regain and realize the truth that man is more than a material body. Man is a spirit. Meiklejohn, however, has no notion of reviving the discredited supernaturalism of the past to prove that man is a spirit. Too often Americans, in giving up the old supernaturalism, have also given up the realities that the old terms sought, however inadequately, to express. To our author "a spirit is a man so viewed that we can admire or despise 'him.' A human body, on the other hand, is a man so viewed that words of praise and blame are, in relation to him, meaningless." In other words, a man takes an attitude toward life or any issue that arises. That attitude, if worthy of praise, shows him to have an admirable spirit; if worthy of condemnation, a base spirit.

Now our American Revolutionary founders of this Republic sought to guarantee liberty to the spirits of men forever. That is why the states insisted on the Bill of Rights, or the first ten amendments to our constitution immediately upon its adoption. Thus, spiritual liberty to worship or not worship as one chooses and the other liberties for the spirits of men, without which they cannot be wholly men, were guaranteed by the First Amendment, which it may not be amiss to quote,

> "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Notice that all these liberties are for the spirits of men. Men are not guaranteed any liberties concerning their actions, nor as to what they may do with their property. Quite correctly, as we know our American history, does Meiklejohn realize that in a frontier nation with an unexplored continent to the West of it, liberty to many men did mean what a trustee of a church, of which the reviewer was minister, took it to mean when he said, "I can do what I want with my money." It still means that to Mr. Hoover, judging from his *Challenge to Liberty*. It certainly means that as a minimum to the members of the miscalled American Liberty League. Here is the book to refute their claims conclusively. For the Fifth Amendment, adopted at the same time as the First, of course, provides that no one shall

> "be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

Is not the logical deduction that if the use of property becomes destructive of the general welfare people may be deprived of such property by "due process of law," and that private property may "be taken for public use" with just compensation? Even if our present Supreme Court may rule otherwise, and even if any Supreme Court might so rule until the adoption of Congressman Marcantonio's proposed Amendment, our author makes a good case both in the intentions and in the expression of those intentions in the minds of the founding fathers of our democracy. A mighty champion for democracy is our author with a firm faith in the people as a whole to do the right thing, when once the people awake to what needs to be done.

One must note the author's contribution to the increasing condemnation of our capitalistic system. "The essential defeat [I wonder if the word should not be 'defect'] of the capitalistic order is, in my opinion, that it is revolting as a form of human behavior. It makes the men who engage in it ashamed of themselves. It is hostile to liberty. It does not make men free. It makes them slaves." (p. 242.)

He finds "two exceedingly powerful reasons which seem to me to make imperative a decision on the side

of the social directing of industry." First, it makes its appeal to human selfishness rather than to the higher things of men's spirits. Second, "the competitive order is wholly unsuited to the purposes of a democracy." Democracy is founded not only on liberty, but also on equality and fraternity. Page Thomas Jefferson and the immortal Declaration of Independence. Liberty, interpreted as Mr. Hearst and the Liberty Leaguers would interpret it, crushes equality and makes brotherhood a shambles. The big indictment against capitalism in our democracy is "that common people cannot make the decisions which are needed. They cannot understand what is going on. The system is too complicated for them. Most of us when confronted with the bewildering complexities of prices, wages, profits, rent, interest, capital, credits, currencies, inflations, cannot tell what is being talked about. And this means, of course, that we cannot play our proper part in the life of a democracy. . . . Democracy, therefore, breaks down." (p. 244.)

Certainly, every reader of UNITY, alert to the challenging problems America faces today, will want to read and own this book. Its closing chapter on "What Shall We Do?" is alone worth more than the volume's price. You will thrill at Meiklejohn's vision of the possibilities of education not only for boys and girls, but throughout life for all adults. His incontrovertible plea for newspapers that shall be absolutely free of those who have an economic axe to grind is well nigh matchless. So too is his arraignment of capitalism, as we have briefly noted above; and last, but by no means least, his statesmanlike plea to solve our economic problem "above the noise" of our class warfare. He is no idealist only, divorced from the stern realities of capitalism's collapse and its attempt to keep going for a season by turning Fascist. He knows that violence is the method by which the exploiters seek to continue their exploitation of the underprivileged, and it is no wonder that in sheer desperation the exploited sometimes do turn to violence in a mad attempt to live. Yet, he also knows the essential suicide of such a retaliatory policy, and pleads for a true American attitude upon the part of all, worthy of that exalted name, to seek a cooperative solution that will guarantee economic liberty, equality and fraternity unto all. Yet when the economic problem is solved, our real problems of developing the creative possibilities of mankind under a cooperative order will have just begun, for man is essentially a spirit.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Clive of India

CLIVE. *By R. J. Minney. London: Jarrolds. $2.00.*

As, amid a tumult of falling empires, the shadows swiftly lengthen over England's imperial dominion in the Dekkan, it is perhaps instructive to return to the origins of that empire, and, above all, to its founder and dictator—Caesar, Augustus, and Nero, united in one personality—the man who, in the eighteenth century, alone mastered for England these costly realms, and whom, therefore, we give the title famed in cinema and story: CLIVE OF INDIA. An outline sketch of that career as recently presented can scarcely fail of instruction for all students of Asia today—wherefore (making due allowance for *errata* rising from R. J. Minney's hero-worship and imperial enthusiasm) we shall follow with him Clive's tempestuous conquering march to its tragic destination.

Daring, audacious, defiant from his cradle upwards, Bob Clive was born with an ungovernable temper destined to mold the history of mankind. It is in reality the humors of that warlike temper with which Mr. Minney's pageant pages are concerned; and the occasional wistful touches only heighten and enhance a portrait of overweening pride, of blind and murderous rage, which, beginning its lashings in 1725 at Drayton, Shropshire, by a juvenile reign as terror of the town, charged full length across India of the eighteenth century, sweeping France's rule into the Indian Ocean, trampling on rajah and Company alike, satiated only when, like the brazen Talus of legend, it had flailed the entire Mogul empire into the British commonwealth. Then, its work accomplished, Clive's temper (like some demon rending the body no longer able to serve it) turned inward; and, having with its aid outdone both Caesar and Alexander, in turn he fell victim to its frenzy and was annihilated. A most terrifying spectacle, in truth, to which, except perhaps Swift, history offers no parallel.

And it is set, this amazing man-destroying melodrama, against a background uniting the languors of England's Augustan Age with the blazing sun-colors of the Far East. "Marble palaces patterned like delicate lace," "brocades and silks," "muslins with no more substance than the mist of morning," "swords with watered blades emblazoned exquisitely with triumphs of the hunt and the fray," "the worship of animals," "widows who flung themselves upon their husbands' pyres and perished in an ecstasy of enjoined devotion," "jungles prowling with beasts and snakes," "weird illnesses that stiffened the limbs in death within an hour" —these are contrasted with the gay world of Beau Nash and Peg Woffington, David Garrick and "Dr. Johnson, convulsed and grimacing on his dictionary in Gough Square," "Fielding and Richardson adding fresh leaves to laurels already won," Elizabeth Chudleigh and her fantastic capers, peers gambling, drinking, "spitting in hats," Reynolds, Gainsborough, and their great coterie of painters; a world of "bear gardens, cock pits, and stately minuets, of pillories attended by throngs in public squares, of fans and screens and sponging houses." Against this background, then, an ordered kaleidoscopic confusion sharply commingling East and West, Clive (or rather his temper) takes its fantastic way. What were the incidents in that journey?

With plentiful pageantry Mr. Minney displays them: exile to Madras as Company clerk; first triumphs of his rival Dupleix; Clive's relief of Trichinopoly, sounding the death-knell for France's hopes; golden romance with Margaret Maskelyne; return to England and Parliament days, followed by ejection from Commons and India once more; downfall of Dupleix before French intrigue, leaving Clive free to master the Dekkan; despotic devil-worship of Surajah Dowlah, and the Black Hole; Clive and Watson's summary vengeance by land and by sea, with England's honor forever stained by a forged treaty; oriental riches and glory heaped upon the triumphant conqueror, now organizing his newly-acquired realms; decisive defeat of Dutch aggression; England once more, and further honors, accompanied by chaos for India and atrocities worse than the Black Hole; return to India and annexation of his vast estate to the Empire; Caesarian splendors, indulged in by the dictatorial demon in-

habiting Robert Clive; final return to England, and engulfment in a whole host of enemies, after whose destruction Clive's familiar turns its talons upon himself, to the annihilation of this quondam Alexander and the century-and-more effacement of his mighty memory.

Such is the story of Clive of India—the tale, as we have frequently intimated, of a man possessed by a demoniacal urge; practically speaking, the story of that urge itself. As briefly as possible, and with no more confusion than necessary in sketching a career so complex, we have tried to indicate its outlines; now for its import. What does it mean to posterity that a devil-ridden Englishman, in the first new era of falling empires, raged across that era, and conquered, organized, and looted for England the tremendous Asiatic dominion even now hanging by a thread, and doomed, sooner or later, ultimately to be lost to England forever? Setting on one side the man himself: his tumultuous rages, his fits of tenderness, his ironic humors, his granite will—can nothing in the nature of a higher destiny be gleaned from the fact that, whatever his failings, he *united* that empire, so soon to be severed from the world-realm to which he wedded it, that it might alone survive to a newer and more splendid destiny, one and indivisible?

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Correspondence

Further Reply from Dr. Whitaker

Editor of UNITY: I hope you will let the bit of verse I am sending, written this morning, be my reply to your reply to my letter. If there is any viler humbug in our public life than the pretense that the courts are bulwarks of either freedom or justice for the people, it is the humbug of the alleged freedom of the press. Do the Courts protect freedom of speech, for the people? They do not. Do they protect freedom of assembly, for the people? They do not. Why, then, do they protect freedom for the press? Because the press is the right hand bower of the plunderbund, part of the property of the plunderbund to such extent that the press of protest, with no circulation in comparison, can be generally allowed to run under the wagon, and not always even so.

Even the Tennessee River decision is so restricted as to meeting the main issue and, within the circumscribed area of the Court's consent, so obviously part of the nation's power over navigable streams, that it concedes only what could not be denied without such risk of public upheaval as might have put the Supreme Court in danger for any further exercise of dictatorship.

Even if the Supreme Court's decisions were generally against War, and against Mammon, any people who have to depend for their freedom on the inevitably prejudiced interpretations of a College of Cardinals in the economic field are back in the Middle Ages. Your generosities have obscured your sight.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Los Gatos, California.

[The "bit of verse" enclosed by Dr. Whitaker]

What means the freedom of the press
  When men like Hearst control?
When Money-Bags hold in duress
  The public mind and soul?

When any lying fool can force
  Your very chamber door?
And boys bawl on the streets, till hoarse,
  Your heart's remotest sore?

When the assassin of your name
  Out-does the thief at night?
And none immunity may claim
  Against moronic spite?

Freedom to cry all freedom down,
  To sell out Labor's cause;
Your very Court of last renown
  Approving mobsters' laws.

What is this sham which good men praise?
  That freedom, most secure,
Which most security betrays
  Where plunder rides the poor.

R. W.

Forthcoming Articles

The Pacifism of the Early Christians—Edmund B. Chaffee

What Can We Learn from Germany?—Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron

Icarus Folds His Wings—Harold P. Marley

The Cure of Disillusionment—John Haynes Holmes

Kagawa of Japan—George Maychin Stockdale

A Plowman's Way of the Cross—Jay G. Sigmund

Help Our Drive for More Readers of UNITY

By securing at least one new subscriber within the next thirty days!

Use the attached form.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No. .....

City ..... State .....

$3.00 for a year's subscription.
($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries.)

☐ Remittance enclosed.
☐ Send invoice.

The Field

(*Continued from page 22*)

Constitution of the United States.

People do not voluntarily surrender their liberty, once they have enjoyed it. Thomas Jefferson said, you will recall:

"Where every man is a sharer in the direction of his ward republic or some of the higher ones, and feels that he is a participator in the government of affairs, not merely at an election one day in the year, but every day, he will let the heart be torn out of his body sooner than his power wrested from him by a Caesar or a Bonaparte."

Men may be cheated out of it, misled and deceived into surrendering their liberty, or they may be subjugated by force. But they do not surrender these things voluntarily. If the guaranties of the Constitution of the United States remain intact, if the Court remains intact, there is little chance indeed for arbitrary government for any considerable length of time, especially.

To put it another way, the only sure cure for Communism or Fascism is Americanism. I use that term, not as we use it on the Fourth of July or on state occasions, but as an expression of the doctrine of individual liberty.

It does not seem to me that there is nearly so much danger to our institutions in the out-and-out advocates of Communism or Fascism as there is in our tendency to praise the principles of democracy but employ the methods of Fascism. In the way of illustration, I read in a current magazine the words of an important official, which are as follows:

"Certain conclusions appear clear. In the first place it seems clear that in these difficult times we need centralization of leadership. Decentralization of leadership may be a good thing for local matters, but what can it avail in our national affairs If such leadership is an important requirement, from what source can it be obtained? Can it come from 435 Congressmen and the 96 Senators? Can it come from the nine Justices of the Supreme Court? It would appear that the Chief Executive is the only source from which national leadership may be sought with any hope of effective results."

Mussolini never stated the doctrine of Fascism with greater boldness or greater clarity than it is here stated. "Centralization of leadership." We have a practical and impressive illustration of that now. Mussolini having silenced the voice of the people, having reduced to pitiable impotency the representatives of the people, having disregarded the Constitution and having made subservient the judges so that no citizen can appeal to the courts for justice, according to the Constitution, leads his people according to the discretion and judgment of "centralization of leadership." There you have speedy action, quick decision, undivided responsibility, with no power of appeal to the courts or to the Constitution, and no right of discussion.

Here in this official's statement is an unmistakable contention that courts and constitutions and Members of the Congress elected by the people are an impediment.

Then follows, although it is not mentioned, what must inevitably follow, that free speech, and a free press, and the right of assemblage, would be an impediment to "centralized leadership."

Individual leadership has its place, but there is a higher leadership to which all individual leadership must be subordinated, and that is the leadership which comes from the combined heart and brain and from the conscience and the soul of millions of intelligent and patriotic people. That is a leadership less amenable to the call of ambition, less likely to suffer from the corroding effect of power, and more likely to take into consideration the welfare of all.

When you remove the restraints of popular judgment you not only have taken the first step but you have taken the last step toward absolute dictatorial power; I do not care what you call it.

We hear constantly about these "difficult times" as an argument in favor of wiping out all the rights and guaranties given the people under the Constitution. It was in "difficult times," very difficult times, times which tried men's souls, that the Constitution was written, and "centralization of leadership" was for all times rejected. It was in "difficult times," when economic and financial chaos reigned, that Washington calmly rejected the proffered "centralization of leadership." It was in "difficult times," very difficult times, a time when we were torn with civil strife, that the great martyr declared that the Government of the people must not perish.

They had faith in our form of government, and, difficult as the times were, they did not indulge in the defeatist policy of surrendering the vital principles upon which a free government rests. A little patience, a little courage, a little faith, will stimulate tremendously one's confidence in the efficiency and the permanency of constitutional government.

William E. Borah.

In the February-March Issue of

The New Humanist

THE CHALLENGE TO SOCIAL SCIENCE
Harry Elmer Barnes

HUMANISM AND THE FRONTIERS OF MODERN CULTURE
Oliver L. Reiser

SHELLEY RECONSIDERED
Carl Grabo

THE HUMANIST IMMORTALITY OF THE POET HORACE
Charles Lyttle

PROFITS AND PROGRESS
Earl Wilcox

THE SECULARIZATION OF ETHICS
F. S. Marvin

IN DEFENSE OF THE INTOLERANT RADICAL
John MacKinnon

Free with each new subscription, any *one* of the following books postpaid:

HUMANISM—A WAY OF LIFE
By Joseph Walker
THE CHALLENGE OF HUMANISM
By W. B. Tavenor
HUMANIST RELIGION
By C. W. Reese

Yearly $1.50 **Per Copy 25c**
Canadian and Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by

THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, Inc.
330 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois

LAFOLLETTE'S
Great National Weekly Newspaper
"The Progressive"

Regular price $1.50 per year
Startling facts suppressed by other papers are being exposed now. Political corruption, advertised fakes which poison and plunder the consumers, how the public is humbugged by propaganda in newspapers: these are some of the sensational revelations appearing in the next 10 issues.

Special offer 10 weeks for 20c
Open to new readers only.
Send 20 cents today for the next 10 sensational issues. The Progressive, Dept. 23 Madison, Wis.